Als Typoskript gedruckt

Technische Universität Dresden

Herausgeber: Der Rektor

arXiv:1409.1128v1 [math-ph] 3 Sep 2014

On Some Models in Linear Thermo-Elasticity with Rational Material Laws.

S. Mukhopadhyay, R. Picard, S. Trostorff, M. Waurick
Institut für Analysis

MATH-AN-04-2014

On Some Models in Linear Thermo-Elasticity with Rational Material Laws.

S. Mukhopadhyay*, R. Picard, S. Trostorff, M. Waurick†

September 4, 2014

Abstract: We shall consider some common models in linear thermo-elasticity within a common structural framework. Due to the flexibility of the structural perspective we will obtain well-posedness results for a large class of generalized models allowing for more general material properties such as anisotropies, inhomogeneities, etc.

0 Introduction

The coupled dynamical thermoelasticity (CTE) theory was developed by Biot [1] to eliminate the drawback of uncoupled theory of thermoelasticity that the elastic changes in a material have no effects on temperature. Like other classical thermodynamical theories of continua, this theory is developed on the basis of firm grounds of irreversible thermodynamics by employing Fourier's law and has been used to study the coupling effects of elastic and thermal fields over the years. However, this theory suffers from the paradox of infinite heat propagation speed and predicts unsatisfactory descriptions of a solid's response to some situations, like fast transient loading at low temperature, etc. Generalized thermoelasticity theories are therefore developed in last few decades with the aim to eliminate this drawback. Extended thermoelasticity (ETE) theory was introduced by Lord and Shulman [2] by employing a modified Fourier law proposed by Catteneo [3] and Vernotte [4, 5] that includes one thermal relaxation time parameter. Temperature-rate dependent thermoelasticity (TRDTE) theory by Green and Lindsay [6] and thermoelasticity theories of type I, II and III by Green and Naghdi [7, 8, 9] are also advocated in this context. Later on, Chandrasekharaiah [10] modified the governing equations of thermoelasticity on the basis of a so-called dual phase-lag heat conduction equation due to Tzou [11, 12] and proposed two different models of thermoelasticity, namely dual phase-lag model- I (DPL-I) and dual phase-lag model- II (DPL-II). The dual phase lag heat conduction law is supposed to be the macroscopic formulation of the microscopic effects in heat transport processes. A possible application of this generalized heat conduction law

* *S. Mukhopadhyay:* Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi -221005, India: Corresponding author: E-mail: mukhosant.apm@iitbhu.ac.in

† *R. Picard*, *S. Trostorff, M. Waurick*: Institute for Analysis, Faculty of Mathematics and Sciences, TU-Dresden, Germany.

arises in the modeling of laser pulses. It has been found out that laser pulses can be shortened to the range of femtoseconds (10^{-15} s). When the response time becomes shorter, the non-equilibrium thermodynamic transition and the microscopic effects in the energy exchange during heat transport procedure become pronounced (Tzou [13]). The formulation therefore becomes microscopic in nature. The dual phase-lag heat conduction law incorporates this microscopic effects in heat transport process by introducing two macroscopic lagging (or delayed) responses as possible outcomes. A detailed history about the development of some well- established non-Fourier heat conduction models and their importance are available in the references [14, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23].

Recently, a structural formulation for linear material laws in classical mathematical physics was reported by Picard [24]. Here, a class of evolutionary problems is considered to cover a number of initial boundary value problems of classical mathematical physics and the solution theory is established. The well-posedness of classical thermoelasticity and Lord Shulman theory was shown to be covered by this model. The main objective of this present work is to show that the aforementioned models of generalized thermoelasticity can be treated within the common structural framework of evolutionary equations. Due to the flexibility of the structural perspective we will obtain well-posedness results for a large class of generalized models allowing for more general material properties such as anisotropies, inhomogeneities, etc. The solution strategy is not based on constructions involving fundamental solutions (semi-group theory), which will allow for even more general materials resulting for example in changes of type (e.g. from parabolic to hyperbolic) or for suitable non-local material properties involving e.g. spatial integral operators. It should be noted that evolutionary equations in the form just discussed have also been studied with regards to homogenization theory, see e.g. [25, 26, 27]. Hence, the general perspective on thermo-elasticity to be presented may also shed some new light on the theory of homogenization of such models.

The article is structured as follows. We begin to introduce the framework of evolutionary equations and recall the general well-posedness result. We will focus on so-called rational material laws defined as functions of the time-derivative ∂_0, which is established as a normal operator in a suitable exponentially weighted L^2-space. In the proceeding sections we will show, how the different models of generalized elasticity can be incorporated into this framework and we will derive assumptions on the material coefficients yielding the well-posedness of the corresponding evolutionary equations.

1 Foundations

1.1 The framework of evolutionary equations

The family of Hilbert spaces $(H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H))_{\varrho\in\mathbb{R}}$, H complex Hilbert space, with $H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H) := L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_\varrho, H)$, where the measure μ_ϱ is defined by $\mu_\varrho(S) := \int_S \exp(-2\varrho t)\, \mathrm{d}t$, $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ a Borel set, $\varrho \in \mathbb{R}$, provides the desired Hilbert space setting for evolutionary problems (cf. [28, 29]). The sign of ϱ is associated with the direction of causality, where the positive sign is linked to forward causality. Since we have a preference for forward causality, we shall usually assume

that $\varrho \in]0,\infty[$. By construction of these spaces, we can establish

$$\begin{aligned}\exp(-\varrho\mathbf{m}_0) : H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R},H) &\to H_{0,0}(\mathbb{R},H)\,(= L^2(\mathbb{R},H))\\ \varphi &\mapsto \exp(-\varrho\mathbf{m}_0)\,\varphi\end{aligned}$$

where $(\exp(-\varrho\mathbf{m}_0)\,\varphi)(t) := \exp(-\varrho t)\,\varphi(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, as a unitary mapping. We use $\mathbf{m}_0$ as a notation for the multiplication-by-argument operator corresponding to the time parameter.

In this Hilbert space setting the time-derivative operation, defined as the closure of

$$\begin{aligned}\mathring{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R},H) \subseteq H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R},H) &\to H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R},H)\\ \varphi &\mapsto \dot{\varphi},\end{aligned}$$

where by $\mathring{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R},H)$ we denote the space of arbitrary differentiable functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to H having compact support, generates a normal operator $\partial_{0,\varrho}$ with[1]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{Re}\,\partial_{0,\varrho} &= \varrho,\\ \mathfrak{Im}\,\partial_{0,\varrho} &= \frac{1}{\mathrm{i}}\left(\partial_{0,\varrho} - \varrho\right).\end{aligned}$$

The skew-selfadjoint operator $\mathrm{i}\,\mathfrak{Im}\,\partial_{0,\varrho}$ is unitarily equivalent to the differentiation operator $\partial_{0,0}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R},H) = H_0(\mathbb{R},H)$ with domain $H^1(\mathbb{R},H)$ - the space of weakly differentiable functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R},H)$ - via

$$\mathrm{i}\,\mathfrak{Im}\,\partial_{0,\varrho} = \left(\exp(-\varrho\mathbf{m}_0)\right)^{-1}\partial_{0,0}\exp(-\varrho\mathbf{m}_0)$$

and has the Fourier-Laplace transformation as its spectral representation, which is the unitary transformation

$$\mathcal{L}_\varrho := \mathcal{F}\,\exp(-\varrho\mathbf{m}_0) : H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R},H) \to L^2(\mathbb{R},H),$$

where $\mathcal{F} : L^2(\mathbb{R},H) \to L^2(\mathbb{R},H)$ is the Fourier transformation given as the unitary extension of

$$\mathring{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R},H) \ni \varphi \mapsto \left(s \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp(-\mathrm{i}s\cdot t)\varphi(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right).$$

Indeed, this follows from the well-known fact that $\mathcal{F}$ is unitary in $L^2(\mathbb{R},H)$ and a spectral representation for $\frac{1}{\mathrm{i}}\partial_{0,0}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R},H)$. In particular, we have

$$\mathfrak{Im}\,\partial_{0,\varrho} = \mathcal{L}_\varrho^*\mathbf{m}_0\mathcal{L}_\varrho$$

[1] Recall that for normal operators N in a Hilbert space H

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{Re}\,N &:= \frac{1}{2}\overline{(N+N^*)},\\ \mathfrak{Im}\,N &:= \frac{1}{2\mathrm{i}}\overline{(N-N^*)}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$N = \mathfrak{Re}\,N + \mathrm{i}\,\mathfrak{Im}\,N.$$

It is

$$D(N) = D(\mathfrak{Re}\,N) \cap D(\mathfrak{Im}\,N).$$

and thus,

$$\partial_{0,\varrho} = \mathcal{L}_\varrho^* \left(\mathrm{i}\mathbf{m}_0 + \varrho\right) \mathcal{L}_\varrho.$$

It is crucial to note that for $\varrho \neq 0$ we have that $\partial_{0,\varrho}$ has a bounded inverse. Indeed, for $\varrho > 0$ we find from $\mathfrak{Re}\, \partial_{0,\varrho} = \varrho$ that

$$\left\| \partial_{0,\varrho}^{-1} \right\|_{\varrho,0} = \frac{1}{\varrho}, \tag{1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\varrho,0}$, $\varrho \in]0,\infty[$ denotes the operator norm on $H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$. For continuous functions φ with compact support we find

$$\left(\partial_{0,\varrho}^{-1}\varphi\right)(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \varphi(s)\ \mathrm{d}s,\ t \in \mathbb{R}, \varrho \in]0,\infty[\,, \tag{2}$$

which shows the causality of $\partial_{0,\varrho}^{-1}$ for $\varrho > 0$.[2] Since it is usually clear from the context which ϱ has been chosen, we shall, as it is customary, drop the index ϱ from the notation for the time derivative and simply use ∂_0 instead of $\partial_{0,\varrho}$.
We are now able to define operator-valued functions of ∂_0 via the induced function calculus of ∂_0^{-1} as

$$M\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) \coloneqq \mathcal{L}_\varrho^* M\left(\left(\mathrm{i}\mathbf{m}_0 + \varrho\right)^{-1}\right) \mathcal{L}_\varrho.$$

Here, we require that $z \mapsto M(z)$ is a bounded, analytic function defined on $B_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2\varrho_0}, \frac{1}{2\varrho_0}\right)$ for some $\varrho_0 \in]0,\infty[$ attaining values in $L(H)$, the space of bounded linear operators on H. Then, for $\varrho > \varrho_0$ the operator $M\left(\left(\mathrm{i}\mathbf{m}_0 + \varrho\right)^{-1}\right)$ defined as

$$\left(M\left(\left(\mathrm{i}\mathbf{m}_0 + \varrho\right)^{-1}\right) f\right)(t) \coloneqq M\left(\left(\mathrm{i}t + \varrho\right)^{-1}\right) f(t) \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}, f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, H))$$

is bounded and linear, and hence $M(\partial_0^{-1}) \in L(H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H))$. Moreover, due to the analyticity of M we obtain that $M(\partial_0^{-1})$ becomes causal (see [24, Theorem 2.10]).
We recall from [24] (and the concluding chapter of [28]) that the common form of standard initial boundary value problems of mathematical physics is given by

$$\overline{\left(\partial_0 M\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) + A\right)} U = F, \tag{3}$$

where A is the canonical skew-selfadjoint extension to $H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$ of a skew-selfadjoint operator in H. We recall the well-posedness result for this class of problems.

Theorem 1.1 ([24, Solution Theory])**.** *Let $A : D(A) \subseteq H \to H$ be a skew-selfadjoint operator and $M : B\left(\frac{1}{2\varrho_0}, \frac{1}{2\varrho_0}\right) \to L(H)$ an analytic and bounded mapping, where $\varrho_0 \in]0,\infty[$. Assume that there is $c \in]0,\infty[$ such that for all $z \in B\left(\frac{1}{2\varrho_0}, \frac{1}{2\varrho_0}\right)$ the estimate*

$$\mathfrak{Re}\, z^{-1} M(z) = \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{-1} M(z) + \left(z^{-1}\right)^* M(z)^*\right) \geq c \tag{4}$$

[2] If $\varrho < 0$ the operator $\partial_{0,\varrho}$ is also boundedly invertible and its inverse is given by

$$\left(\partial_{0,\varrho}^{-1}\varphi\right)(t) = -\int_t^\infty \varphi(s)\, ds \quad (t \in \mathbb{R})$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathring{C}_\infty(\mathbb{R}, H)$. Thus, $\varrho < 0$ corresponds to the backward causal (or anticausal) case.

holds. For $\varrho > \varrho_0$ we denote the canonical extension of A to $H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$ again by A. Then the evolutionary problem

$$\overline{\left(\partial_0 M\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) + A\right)} U = F$$

is well-posed in the sense that $\overline{\left(\partial_0 M\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) + A\right)}$ has a bounded inverse on $H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$. Moreover, the inverse is causal.

For the models under consideration it suffices to consider M as a rational, bounded-operator-valued function, which, possibly by eliminating removable singularities, is analytic at 0 (in [24] these material laws are called $0-$analytic). This means in particular that M can be factorized in the form

$$M(z) = \prod_{k=0}^{s} Q_k(z)^{-1} P_k(z) \tag{5}$$

where P_k, Q_k are polynomials.[3] In this case, condition (4) simplifies to

$$\varrho M(0) + \mathfrak{Re}\, M'(0) \geq c \tag{6}$$

for some $c > 0$ and all sufficiently large $\varrho > 0$. Indeed, the only difference between the expression in (6) and (4) are terms multiplied by a multiple of $|z| = \left|\frac{1}{it+\varrho}\right|$, which are eventually small, if $\varrho > 0$ is chosen sufficiently large. A finer classification of these models can be obtained by looking at the (unbounded) linear operator A and the "zero patterns" of $M(0)$ and $\mathfrak{Re} M'(0)$.

1.2 The equations of thermo-elasticity

We start with the classical equations of irreversible thermo-elasticity in an elastic body $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ due to Biot [1]. Before we can formulate these equations properly, we need to define the spatial differential operators involved.

Definition 1.2. We define the operator $\mathring{\text{grad}}$ as the closure of

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad}\,|_{\mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)} : \mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega) \subseteq L^2(\Omega) &\to L^2(\Omega)^3 \\ \phi &\mapsto (\partial_1\phi, \partial_2\phi, \partial_3\phi), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $\mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)$ denotes the space of smooth functions with compact support in Ω. Likewise we define $\mathring{\text{div}}$ as the closure of

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}\,|_{\mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)^3} : \mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)^3 \subseteq L^2(\Omega)^3 &\to L^2(\Omega) \\ (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3) &\mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{3} \partial_i \phi_i. \end{aligned}$$

[3] The form $U = M\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) V$ may be interpreted as coming from solving an integro-differential equation of the form

$$\partial_0^N Q\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) U = \partial_0^N P\left(\partial_0^{-1}\right) V,$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is the degree of the operator polynomial Q.

Integration by parts yield $\mathring{\operatorname{grad}} \subseteq -\left(\mathring{\operatorname{div}}\right)^* =: \operatorname{grad}$ and, similarly, $\mathring{\operatorname{div}} \subseteq -\left(\mathring{\operatorname{grad}}\right)^* =: \operatorname{div}$. Moreover, we define the operator

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{sym} : L^2(\Omega)^{3\times 3} &\to L^2(\Omega)^{3\times 3}\\ \Phi &\mapsto \left(x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}\left(\Phi(x) + \Phi(x)^\top\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

which clearly is the orthogonal projector onto the closed subspace

$$L^2_{\operatorname{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3} := \left\{\Phi \in L^2(\Omega)^{3\times 3} \,|\, \Phi(x) = \Phi(x)^\top \quad (x \in \Omega \text{ a.e.})\right\}$$

of $L^2(\Omega)^{3\times 3}$. Similar to the definition above, we define the operator $\mathring{\operatorname{Grad}}$ as the closure of

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Grad}|_{\mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)^3} : \mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)^3 \subseteq L^2(\Omega)^3 &\to L^2_{\operatorname{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3}\\ (\phi_1,\phi_2,\phi_3) &\mapsto \left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_j\phi_i + \partial_i\phi_j\right)\right)_{i,j\in\{1,2,3\}}\end{aligned}$$

and $\mathring{\operatorname{Div}}$ as the closure of

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Div}|_{\operatorname{sym}[\mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)^{3\times 3}]} : \operatorname{sym}[\mathring{C}_\infty(\Omega)^{3\times 3}] \subseteq L^2_{\operatorname{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3} &\to L^2(\Omega)^3\\ (\phi_{ij})_{i,j\in\{1,2,3\}} &\mapsto \left(\sum_{j=1}^{3}\partial_j\phi_{ij}\right)_{i\in\{1,2,3\}}.\end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts we again obtain $\mathring{\operatorname{Grad}} \subseteq -\left(\mathring{\operatorname{Div}}\right)^* =: \operatorname{Grad}$ as well as $\mathring{\operatorname{Div}} \subseteq -\left(\mathring{\operatorname{Grad}}\right)^* =: \operatorname{Div}$.

We are now able to formulate the equations of thermo-elasticity. Let $u \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\Omega)^3)$ denote the displacement-field of the elastic body Ω and $\sigma \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2_{\operatorname{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ the stress. Then u and σ satisfy the balance of momentum equation

$$\varrho_0\partial_0^2 u - \operatorname{Div}\sigma = f, \tag{7}$$

where $\varrho_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ denotes the mass-density of Ω and $f \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\Omega)^3)$ is an external forcing term. Furthermore, let $\eta \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\Omega))$ denote the entropy and $q \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\Omega)^3)$ the heat flux. Then, these quantities satisfy the conservation law

$$\varrho_0\partial_0\eta + \operatorname{div}(T_0^{-1}q) = T_0^{-1}h, \tag{8}$$

where T_0 denotes the reference temperature[4] and $h \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\Omega))$ is a heating source term. The equations are completed by the following relations

$$\sigma = C\varepsilon - \Gamma\theta, \tag{9}$$

$$\varrho_0\eta = \Gamma^*\varepsilon + \nu\theta, \tag{10}$$

$$q = -\kappa\operatorname{grad}\theta. \tag{11}$$

[4]For simplicity we have set the reference temperature T_0 in the introduction (and also later on) to $T_0 = 1$. In equation (8) we let $T_0 \in]0,\infty[$ be arbitrary to keep the formulation more comparable with the classically proposed models.

Here $\varepsilon = \operatorname{Grad} u$ is the strain, $\theta \in H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\Omega))$ denotes the temperature, $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ is the elasticity tensor, $\nu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ stands for the specific heat, $\kappa \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ denotes the thermal conductivity and $\Gamma \in L(L^2(\Omega), L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ is the thermo-elasticity tensor that results from the Duhamel-Neumann law linking the stress to strain and temperature. Assuming that C is invertible, we may rewrite (9) as

$$\varepsilon = C^{-1}\sigma + C^{-1}\Gamma\theta. \tag{12}$$

Consequently, (10) can be written as

$$\varrho_0 \eta = \Gamma^* C^{-1}\sigma + \left(\Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma + \nu\right)\theta \tag{13}$$

and, hence, with $v \coloneqq \partial_0 u, \sigma, \theta$ and q as our basic unknowns, (7),(11),(12) and (13) can be combined to the following equations on $H_{\varrho,0}(\mathbb{R}, H)$, where $H \coloneqq L^2(\Omega)^3 \oplus L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3} \oplus L^2(\Omega) \oplus L^2(\Omega)^3$:

$$\left(\partial_0 \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C^{-1} & C^{-1}\Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma^* C^{-1} & \Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma + \nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0&0&0&0 \\ 0&0&0&0 \\ 0&0&0&0 \\ 0&0&0&\kappa^{-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\operatorname{Div} & 0 & 0 \\ -\operatorname{Grad} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \operatorname{div} \\ 0 & 0 & \operatorname{grad} & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \begin{pmatrix} v \\ \sigma \\ \theta \\ q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ 0 \\ h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This systems is, at least formally, of the form (3), where $M(\partial_0^{-1}) = M_0 + \partial_0^{-1} M_1$ with

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C^{-1} & C^{-1}\Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma^* C^{-1} & \Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma + \nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \; M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0&0&0&0 \\ 0&0&0&0 \\ 0&0&0&0 \\ 0&0&0&\kappa^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\operatorname{Div} & 0 & 0 \\ -\operatorname{Grad} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \operatorname{div} \\ 0 & 0 & \operatorname{grad} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{14}$$

To make A become skew-selfadjoint, we need to impose boundary conditions on our unknowns. For instance, one could require homogeneous Dirichlet-conditions for v and θ, which can be formulated by $v \in D(\mathring{\operatorname{Grad}})$ and $\theta \in D(\mathring{\operatorname{grad}})$. Then, A becomes

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\operatorname{Div} & 0 & 0 \\ -\mathring{\operatorname{Grad}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \operatorname{div} \\ 0 & 0 & \mathring{\operatorname{grad}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

which clearly is skew-selfadjoint. Of course, other boundary conditions can be imposed making A skew-selfadjoint, see e.g. [30].

As we shall see, the Lord-Shulman model [2], the two dual-phase lag models [11, 12] and the three Green-Naghdy models [7-9] are based on the same relations (9), (10), differences only appearing in the modification of Fourier's law (11). In the case of the Green-Lindsay model [6], although of the same formal shape, the meaning of the temperature θ is replaced by the differential expression $(1 + n_0\partial_0)$ applied to temperature. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion, we shall use in this case

$$\Theta := \theta + n_0\partial_0\theta$$

instead of re-dedicating the symbol θ, where $n_0$is the thermal relaxation time, a characteristic of this model.

2 Solution theory to some thermo-elastic models

In this section we will show that the models of thermo-elasticity mentioned in the introduction can be written as evolutionary problems in the sense of Section 1.1 and thus, their well-posedness can be shown with the help of Theorem 1.1. In fact, we will show that a generalized model of the basic Green-Lindsay type allows to recover all other models as special cases. We will begin to formulate this abstract model and prove its well-posedness. In the subsequent subsection, we will show how the classical models can be recovered from the abstract one and which conditions yield their well-posedness.

2.1 A general rational material law for thermo-elasticity

We consider the following material law $M(\partial_0^{-1}) = M_0 + \partial_0^{-1}M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$, where

$$M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C^{-1} & C^{-1}\Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma^* C^{-1} & \nu + \Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta_0 & \zeta_0^* a_0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_0\zeta_0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{16}$$

$$M_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{17}$$

Here $a_0 \in L(L^2(\Omega)^3)$ is a selfadjoint operator, $\zeta_0 \in L(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)^3)$ and $a_1 : B(0,r) \to L(L^2(\Omega))$ and $a_2 : B(0,r) \to L(L^2(\Omega)^3)$ are rational functions for some $r > 0$. We recall from the previous section that $\varrho_0, \nu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ denote the mass density and the specific heat, respectively, which will be assumed to be real and strictly positive, i.e. $\varrho_0(x), \nu(x) \geq c$ for some $c > 0$ and almost every $x \in \Omega$. Moreover, the elasticity tensor $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ is assumed to be selfadjoint and strictly positive definite.

Theorem 2.1. *Let M_0 and $M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$ be as in (16) and (17), respectively. We assume that $\varrho_0, \nu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ are real-valued and strictly positive and $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ is selfadjoint and*

strictly positive definite. Moreover, we assume that a_0 is strictly positive definite on its range and $\mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)$ is strictly positive definite on the kernel of a_0. Then the evolutionary problem

$$\left(\partial_0 M_0 + M_1(\partial_0^{-1}) + A\right) \begin{pmatrix} v \\ \sigma \\ \Theta \\ q \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f \\ 0 \\ h \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{18}$$

is well-posed in the sense of Theorem 1.1, where A is given by[5] (15) and $\Theta = (1 + n_0\partial_0)\,\theta$.

Proof. According to Theorem 1.1, we need to verify condition (4) for $M(\partial_0^{-1}) = M_0 + \partial_0^{-1} M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$. Or, equivalently, by the structural properties assumed for M_1, we need to verify that there exists $\varrho_1 > 0$ such that for all $\varrho > \varrho_1$ we have that

$$\varrho M_0 + \mathfrak{Re}\, M_1(0) \geq c$$

for some $c > 0$. Indeed, the latter equation is precisely the reformulation of (6) for the particular M under consideration. For $\varrho > 0$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varrho M_0 + \mathfrak{Re}\, M_1(0) \\
&= \varrho \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C^{-1} & C^{-1}\Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma^* C^{-1} & \nu + \Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta & \zeta_0^* a_0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_0\zeta_0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_1(0) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma^* & 1 & \zeta_0^* \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \times \\
&\qquad \left(\varrho \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_1(0) + \zeta_0^* \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)\zeta_0 & -\zeta_0^* \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \\ 0 & 0 & -\mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)\zeta_0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \zeta_0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

We read off that the latter is strictly positive definite if and only if the operator

$$\varrho \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_1(0) + \zeta_0^* \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)\zeta_0 & -\zeta_0^* \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \\ 0 & 0 & -\mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)\zeta_0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \end{pmatrix}$$

is strictly positive definite. As, by assumption, the operators ϱ_0 and C^{-1} are positive definite anyway, we only have to study the positive definiteness of the operator

$$\varrho \begin{pmatrix} \nu & 0 \\ 0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{Re}\, a_1(0) + \zeta_0^* \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)\zeta_0 & -\zeta_0^* \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \\ -\mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)\zeta_0 & \mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

[5] Or any other skew-selfadjoint restriction of (14).

Now, decomposing the underlying (spatial) Hilbert space as

$$L^2(\Omega) \oplus L^2(\Omega)^3 = R\left(\begin{pmatrix} \nu & 0 \\ 0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \oplus N\left(\begin{pmatrix} \nu & 0 \\ 0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix}\right),$$

which can be done, since both a_0 and ν are strictly positive definite on the respective ranges, we realize that (19) is strictly positive definite on $H_{\varrho,0}\left(\mathbb{R}, R\left(\begin{pmatrix} \nu & 0 \\ 0 & a_0 \end{pmatrix}\right)\right)$ with positive definiteness constant arbitrarily large, depending on the choice of $\varrho > 0$. By Euklid's inequality ($2ab \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}a^2 + \varepsilon b^2$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$), the assertion follows, if we show that the operator in (19) is strictly positive definite on the nullspace of a_0. However, by assumption, $\mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0)$ is strictly positive on $N(a_0)$. This yields the assertion. □

Remark 2.2. We write down Equation (18) line by line. It is

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_0 \varrho_0 v - \operatorname{Div} \sigma &= f, \\
\partial_0 C^{-1}\sigma + \partial_0 C^{-1}\Gamma\Theta - \mathring{\operatorname{Grad}} v &= 0, \\
\partial_0 \Gamma^* C^{-1}\sigma + \partial_0 \left(\nu + \Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta_0\right)\Theta + \partial_0 \zeta_0^* a_0 q + a_1(\partial_0^{-1})\Theta + \operatorname{div} q &= h, \\
\partial_0 a_0 \zeta_0 \Theta + \partial_0 a_0 q + a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) q + \mathring{\operatorname{grad}}\Theta &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Defining $u := \partial_0^{-1} v, \varepsilon := \operatorname{Grad} u$ and $\eta := \varrho_0^{-1}\left(\Gamma^*\varepsilon + (\nu + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta_0)\Theta + \zeta_0^* a_0 q + \partial_0^{-1} a_1(\partial_0^{-1})\Theta\right)$ we get from the second line

$$\sigma = C\varepsilon - \Gamma\Theta.$$

Moreover, the fourth line reads as

$$\partial_0 a_0 q + a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) q = -\partial_0 a_0 \zeta_0 \Theta - \mathring{\operatorname{grad}}\Theta$$

and the first line is

$$\partial_0^2 \varrho_0 u - \operatorname{Div} \sigma = f.$$

Finally, the third line reads as

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_0 \varrho_0 \eta + \operatorname{div} q &= \partial_0\left(\Gamma^*\varepsilon + (\nu + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta_0)\Theta + \zeta_0^* a_0 q + \partial_0^{-1} a_1(\partial_0^{-1})\Theta\right) + a_1(\partial_0^{-1})\Theta + \operatorname{div} q \\
&= \partial_0 \Gamma^* C^{-1}\sigma + \partial_0\left(\Gamma^* C^{-1}\Gamma\Theta + \nu + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta_0\right)\Theta + \partial_0 \zeta_0^* a_0 q + a_1(\partial_0^{-1})\Theta + \operatorname{div} q \\
&= h,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\sigma = C\varepsilon - \Gamma\Theta$. Summarizing, our material relations are

$$\partial_0^2 \varrho_0 u - \operatorname{Div} \sigma = f, \tag{20}$$

$$\partial_0 \varrho_0 \eta + \operatorname{div} q = h, \tag{21}$$

$$\sigma = C\varepsilon - \Gamma\Theta, \tag{22}$$

$$\varrho_0 \eta = \Gamma^*\varepsilon + (\nu + \zeta_0^* a_0 \zeta_0)\Theta + \zeta_0^* a_0 q + \partial_0^{-1} a_1(\partial_0^{-1})\Theta, \tag{23}$$

$$\partial_0 a_0 q + a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) q = -\partial_0 a_0 \zeta_0 \Theta - \mathring{\operatorname{grad}}\Theta, \tag{24}$$

$$\Theta = (1 + n_0 \partial_0)\theta. \tag{25}$$

We note that for $n_0 = a_0 = \zeta_0 = a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = 0$ and $a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) = \kappa^{-1}$ we recover the equations of irreversible thermo-elasticity (compare Subsection 1.2).

We will now discuss several models of thermo-elasticity and we will show that they all are covered by the model proposed above. Due to the importance of $M(0) = M_0$, $M'(0) = M_1(0)$ in the discussion of well-posedness, compare (6), we are first lead to distinguish two classes of models.

- Generic models.

  These models are characterized by $M(0) = \mathfrak{Re} M(0)$ being strictly positive definite. For these (6) is always satisfied. Moreover, $M(0) + \varepsilon$ is then also strictly positive definite for any sufficiently small selfadjoint operator ε.

- Degenerate models.

  These models fail to have the remarkable stability with regards to perturbations of the generic models. They are characterized by $M(0) = \mathfrak{Re} M(0)$ having a non-trivial null space. In these cases (6) can be ensured for example by assuming that $M(0) = \mathfrak{Re}\, M(0)$ is strictly positive definite on its own range $M(0)[H]$, i.e.

  $$\langle x | M(0)\, x \rangle_H \geq c_0 > 0 \text{ for all } x \in M(0)[H],$$

  and $\mathfrak{Re}\, M'(0)$ being strictly positive definite on the null space $[\{0\}]\, M(0)$, i.e.

  $$\langle x | \mathfrak{Re}\, M'(0)\, x \rangle_H \geq c_0 > 0 \text{ for all } x \in [\{0\}]\, M(0).$$

2.2 The generic case

2.2.1 Lord-Shulman model

In contrast to the model for irreversible thermo-elasticity (compare Subsection 1.2), Lord and Shulman ([2]) proposed to replace Fourier's law (11) by the so-called Cattaneo modification of Fourier's law (see [3]), which reads as

$$\partial_0 a_0 q + q = -\kappa \mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta,$$

where $a_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is assumed to be real-valued and strictly positive definite. This results in a system of the form (18), where

$$n_0 = \zeta_0 = a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = 0 \text{ and } a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) = \kappa^{-1}. \tag{26}$$

In consequence, we obtain the well-posedness for this model by Theorem 2.1:

Corollary 2.3. *Let M_0, $M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$ and A be given by (16), (17), and a skew-selfadjoint restriction of (14), respectively. Assume that $a_0, \varrho_0, \nu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\kappa \in L(L^2(\Omega)^3)$, $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ are selfadjoint and strictly positive definite[6] as well as (26). Then (18) is well-posed in the sense of Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. It suffices to observe that the kernel of a_0 is trivial. □

[6] For ease of formulation, note that we identified a_0, ϱ_0 and ν with the induced multiplication operators on L^2. In this way, selfadjointness is just the same as to say the respective L^∞-functions assume only real values and, thus, strict positivity coincides with strict positivity of the respective functions.

Remark 2.4. If we mark possible non-zero entries in the operator matrix $M(0)$ by a star, we have the zero-pattern

$$M(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \bigstar & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar \end{pmatrix}.$$

The zero-pattern of M_1 is

$$M_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = M_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, we observe that there are no higher order terms in the material law operator in case of Lord-Shulman model.

2.2.2 Green-Naghdy model of type II

In the models proposed by Green and Naghdy (see [7, 8, 9]) a modified heat flux of the form

$$\begin{aligned} q &= -\partial_0^{-1}\left(k^* + k\partial_0\right) \mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta \\ &= -(\partial_0^{-1}k^* + k)\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta. \end{aligned}$$

is assumed by considering $k, k^* \in \mathbb{R}$ as thermal conductivity and conductivity rate, respectively. Depending on k^* and k, we distinguish between three types of this model. If $k = 0$ and $k^* \neq 0$, we speak about the Green-Naghdy Model of Type II. In this case, the above heat flux satisfies

$$\partial_0 \left(k^*\right)^{-1} q = -\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta.$$

This system is covered by the abstract one if

$$n_0 = \zeta_0 = a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) = 0 \text{ and } a_0 = \left(k^*\right)^{-1}. \tag{27}$$

Hence, $M(0)$ has the zero-pattern

$$M(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \bigstar & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar \end{pmatrix},$$

while

$$M_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The corresponding well-posedness result in a generalized fashion reads as:

Corollary 2.5. *Let M_0, $M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$ and A be given by* (16), (17)*, and a skew-selfadjoint restriction of* (14)*, respectively. Assume that $k^*, \varrho_0, \nu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ are selfadjoint and strictly positive definite as well as* (27)*. Then* (18) *is well-posed in the sense of Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. Again, the assertion follows when applying Theorem 2.1 while observing that $N(a_0) = \{0\}$. □

2.2.3 The generic Green-Lindsay model

As indicated earlier in Section 1.2, here the material relations (9)-(11) are modified to

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &= C\varepsilon - \Gamma\left(\theta + n_0\partial_0\theta\right),\\ \varrho_0\eta &= d\theta + h\partial_0\theta + \Gamma^*\varepsilon - b^*\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta,\\ q &= -b\partial_0\theta - \kappa\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta.\end{aligned}$$

Here b, d are material parameters and $h, n_0 (\neq 0)$ are the thermal relaxation times. Now, letting

$$\Theta := \theta + n_0\partial_0\theta$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\theta &= (1 + n_0\partial_0)^{-1}\,\Theta\\ &= \partial_0^{-1}\left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_0\right)^{-1}\Theta\end{aligned}$$

and the material relations above turn into

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon &= C^{-1}\sigma + C^{-1}\Gamma\Theta,\\ q &= -\left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_0\right)^{-1}\left(b\Theta + \kappa\partial_0^{-1}\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\Theta\right),\end{aligned}$$

which yields,

$$\partial_0 n_0\kappa^{-1}q + \kappa^{-1}q = -\partial_0\kappa^{-1}b\Theta - \mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\Theta.$$

Moreover, we have, using the Neumann series,

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho_0\eta &= d\theta + h\partial_0\theta + \Gamma^*\varepsilon - b^*\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta\\ &= \left(d + h\partial_0\right)\partial_0^{-1}\left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_0\right)^{-1}\Theta + \Gamma^*\varepsilon + b^*\kappa^{-1}b\left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_0\right)^{-1}\Theta + b^*\kappa^{-1}q\\ &= \Gamma^*\varepsilon + \left(\partial_0^{-1}d + h\right)n_0^{-1}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(-\partial_0^{-1}n_0^{-1}\right)^j\Theta + b^*\kappa^{-1}bn_0^{-1}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(-\partial_0^{-1}n_0^{-1})^j\Theta + b^*\kappa^{-1}q\\ &= \Gamma^*\varepsilon + \left(hn_0^{-1} + b^*\kappa^{-1}bn_0^{-1}\right)\Theta + b^*\kappa^{-1}q\\ &\quad + \partial_0^{-1}\left(dn_0^{-1} - \left(h + b^*\kappa^{-1}b\right)n_0^{-2}\right)\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(-\partial_0^{-1}n_0^{-1}\right)^j\Theta\\ &= \Gamma^*\varepsilon + \left(hn_0^{-1} + b^*\kappa^{-1}bn_0^{-1}\right)\Theta + b^*\kappa^{-1}q + \partial_0^{-1}\left(d - \left(h + b^*\kappa^{-1}b\right)n_0^{-1}\right)\left(n_0 + \partial_0^{-1}\right)^{-1}\Theta.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we are in our abstract situation with

$$a_0 = n_0\kappa^{-1}, a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) = \kappa^{-1}, \zeta_0 = bn_0^{-1}, \nu = hn_0^{-1} \text{ and} \tag{28}$$
$$a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = \left(d - \left(h + b^*\kappa^{-1}b\right) n_0^{-1}\right) \left(n_0 + \partial_0^{-1}\right)^{-1}$$

In this case the operator matrix $M(0)$ has the zero-pattern

$$M(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \bigstar & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & \bigstar \\ 0 & 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar \end{pmatrix}.$$

The zero-pattern of $M_1(0)$ is now

$$M_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar \end{pmatrix}.$$

Also, we note that there are higher order terms in the material law operator. The corresponding well-posedness result is therefore noted in the following corollary.

Corollary 2.6. *Let M_0, $M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$ and A be given by* (16), (17), *and a skew-selfadjoint restriction of* (14), *respectively. Let $n_0 > 0$ and assume that $h, \varrho_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $\kappa \in L(L^2(\Omega)^3)$, $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ are selfadjoint and strictly positive definite, $b \in L(L^2(\Omega), L^2(\Omega)^3)$ as well as* (28). *Then* (18) *is well-posed in the sense of Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. Again, note that the kernel of a_0 is trivial. Apply Theorem 2.1. □

2.2.4 Dual phase-lag model of type II

In case of the model DPL-II, apart from (9), (10) we have here the modified Fourier law as

$$\left(1 + n_1\partial_0 + \frac{1}{2}n_1^2\partial_0^2\right) q = -\kappa\left(1 + n_2\partial_0\right) \mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta.$$

where $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ are called phase-lags. Assuming that κ is invertible, we can write the latter relation as

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta &= (1+n_2\partial_0)^{-1}\left(1+n_1\partial_0+\frac{1}{2}n_1^2\partial_0^2\right)\kappa^{-1}q \\
&= \left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_1+\frac{1}{2}n_1^2\partial_0\right)\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}q \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n_1^2\partial_0\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}q+\left(n_1+\partial_0^{-1}\right)\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}q \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-1}\partial_0\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(-\partial_0^{-1}n_2^{-1}\right)^j\kappa^{-1}q+\left(n_1+\partial_0^{-1}\right)\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}q \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-1}\partial_0\kappa^{-1}q-\frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-2}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\left(-\partial_0^{-1}n_2^{-1}\right)^j\kappa^{-1}q+\left(n_1+\partial_0^{-1}\right)\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}q \\
&= \frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-1}\partial_0\kappa^{-1}q+\left(\left(n_1+\partial_0^{-1}\right)-\frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-1}\right)\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}q.
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, this corresponds to the abstract situation when

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n_0=\zeta_0=a_1(\partial_0^{-1})=0 \text{ and} \\
&a_0=\frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-1}\kappa^{-1},\ a_2(\partial_0^{-1})=\left(\left(n_1+\partial_0^{-1}\right)-\frac{1}{2}n_1^2n_2^{-1}\right)\left(\partial_0^{-1}+n_2\right)^{-1}\kappa^{-1}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{29}
$$

Therefore, the zero-pattern of $M(0)$ is

$$
M\left(0\right)=\begin{pmatrix}\bigstar & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0\\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar\end{pmatrix}.
$$

and the zero-pattern of $M_1(0)$ is

$$
M_1=\mathfrak{Re}\,M_1=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&\bigstar\end{pmatrix}.
$$

It is seen that this is similar to the case of the Lord-Shulman model. Thus, the well-posedness conditions are similar to the ones in Corollary 2.3 using (29) instead of (26). However, there are (different) higher order terms in the material law.

2.3 The P-degenerate case

2.3.1 Green-Naghdy model of type- I and type- III

Recall that in the Green-Naghdy model (see Subsection 2.2.2), Fourier's law is replaced by

$$
q=-(\partial_0^{-1}k^*+k)\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta.
$$

In the Green-Naghdy model of type I, it is assumed that $k^* = 0$, $k > 0$. Thus, the above relation becomes $q = -k\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta$, which is the classical Fourier law and so we have

$$M(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \bigstar & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$M_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = M_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar \end{pmatrix},$$

with no higher order terms. This is the classical model of thermoelasticity discussed in the introduction, compare e.g. [31, 32, 33]. In case of the Green-Naghdy model of type III, we have that $k, k^* > 0$. This yields, that the modified Fourier law becomes

$$\left(\partial_0^{-1} k^* + k\right)^{-1} q = -\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta,$$

and hence, we are in the situation of Subsection 2.1 with

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 = \zeta_0 = a_0 = a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = 0 \text{ and} \\ a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) = \left(\partial_0^{-1} k^* + k\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Thus, the zero-patterns of $M(0)$ and $M_1(0)$ look the same as above with the difference that higher order terms appear (i.e. $M_1(\partial_0^{-1}) \neq M_1(0)$). The well-posedness result reads as follows.

Corollary 2.7. *Let M_0, $M_1(\partial_0^{-1})$ and A be given by* (16), (17), *and a skew-selfadjoint restriction of* (14), *respectively. Assume that $\varrho_0, \nu \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $k \in L(L^2(\Omega)^3)$, $C \in L(L^2_{\mathrm{sym}}(\Omega)^{3\times 3})$ are selfadjoint and strictly positive definite, $k^* \in L\left(L^2(\Omega)^3\right)$ as well as* (30). *Then* (18) *is well-posed in the sense of Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. By the strict positive definiteness of k, it follows that $\mathfrak{Re}\, a_2(0) = \mathfrak{Re}\, k^{-1}$ is strictly positive on $L^2(\Omega)^3 = N(0) = N(a_0)$. Now, apply Theorem 2.1 to obtain the required result. □

2.3.2 Dual phase-lag model of type- I

We conclude our considerations by the study of the DPL-I model. Here again, we assume (9) and (10) to hold, while Fourier's law (11) is replaced by

$$(1 + n_1\partial_0)\, q = -\kappa\, (1 + n_2\partial_0)\, \mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta,$$

with two phase-lags $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. The latter gives

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathring{\mathrm{grad}}\theta &= (1 + n_2\partial_0)^{-1} (1 + n_1\partial_0)\, \kappa^{-1} q \\ &= \left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_2\right)^{-1} \left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_1\right) \kappa^{-1} q, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that we are in the case

$$n_0 = \zeta_0 = a_0 = a_1(\partial_0^{-1}) = 0 \text{ and} \qquad (31)$$
$$a_2(\partial_0^{-1}) = \left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_2\right)^{-1} \left(\partial_0^{-1} + n_1\right) \kappa^{-1}.$$

Therefore, the zero-pattern of $M(0)$ is

$$M(0) = \begin{pmatrix} \bigstar & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & \bigstar & \bigstar & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the zero-pattern of $M_1(0)$ is

$$M_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \bigstar \end{pmatrix}.$$

Similarly to Corollary 2.7, using (31) instead of (30) and imposing $n_1 \cdot n_2 > 0$, we get the corresponding well-posedness result also for this type of equation.

4. Conclusion

Various models of thermoelasticity are writen as evolutionary problems and their well posedness results are shown. We formulate an abstract model with rational material laws which is of basic Green-Lindsay type model and we prove its well-posedness. All other models are shown to be recovered from this abstract one and we find the conditions which yield well posedness.

Anowledgement: One of the authors (SM) thankfully acknowledges the extended facilities provided by the Institute of Analysis, Technical University- Dresden, Germany during the period when the present work was carried out.

References

[1] M.A. Biot. Thermoelasticity and irreversible thermodynamics. *J. Appl. Phys.*, 27:240–253, 1956.

[2] H.W. Lord and Y. Shulman. A generalized dynamical theory of thermoelasticity. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 15:299–309, 1967.

[3] C. Cattaneo and J.K. de Fériet. Sur une forme de l'équation de la chaleur éliminant le paradoxe d'une propagation instantanée. In *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences*, number 247, pages 431–433. Gauthier-Villars, 1958.

[4] P. Vernotte. Les paradoxes de la theorie continue de l'équation de la chaleur. In *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences*, number 246, pages 3154–3155. Gauthier-Villars, 1958.

[5] P. Vernotte. Sur quelques complications possibles dans le phénomènes de conduction de la chaleur. In *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences*, number 252, pages 2190–2191. Gauthier-Villars, 1961.

[6] A.E. Green and K.A. Lindsay. Thermoelasticity. *J. Elasticity*, 2(1):1–7, 1972.

[7] A.E. Green and P.M. Naghdi. A re-examination of the basic postulates of thermomechanics. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond., Ser. A*, 432(1885):171–194, 1991.

[8] A. E. Green and P. M. Naghdi. On undamped heat vaes in an elastic solid. *Journal of Thermal Stresses*, 15(2):253–264, 1992.

[9] A.E. Green and P.M. Naghdi. Thermoelasticity without energy dissipation. *J. Elasticity*, 31(3):189–208, 1993.

[10] D. S. Chandrasekharaiah. Hyperbolic thermoelasticity: A review of recent literature. *Appl. Mech. Rev.*, 51(12):705–729, 1998.

[11] D. Y. Tzou. A unified field approach for heat conduction from macro- to micro-scales. *J. Heat Transfer*, 117(1):8–16, 1995.

[12] D. Y. Tzou. The generalized lagging response in small-scale and high-rate heating. *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 38(17):3231 – 3240, 1995.

[13] D.Y. Tzou. *Macro- To Micro-Scale Heat Transfer: The Lagging Behavior*. Chemical and Mechanical Engineering Series. Taylor & Francis, 1996.

[14] D. S. Chandrasekharaiah. Thermoelasticity with second sound: A review. *Appl. Mech. Rev.*, 39(3):355–376, 1986.

[15] J. Ignaczak and R. B. Hetnarski. Generalized thermoelasticity. *Journal of Thermal Stresses*, 22(4-5):451–476, 1999.

[16] R.B. Hetnarski and R. Eslami. *Thermal Stresses – Advanced Theory and Applications: Advanced Theory and Applications*. Solid Mechanics and Its Applications. Springer, 2008.

[17] J. Ignaczak. Generalized thermoelasticity and its applications. Thermal stresses III, Mech. Math. Methods, 2. Ser., Therm. Stresses 3, , 1989.

[18] J. Ignaczak. Domain of Influence Results in Generalized Thermoelasticity–A Survey. *Appl. Mech. Rev.*, 44(9):375–382, 1991.

[19] J. Ignaczak and M. Ostoja-Starzewski. *Thermoelasticity with finite wave speeds.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

[20] D.D. Joseph and L. Preziosi. Heat waves. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 61(1):41–73, 1989.

[21] R. Quintanilla and R. Racke. Qualitative aspects in dual-phase-lag thermoelasticity. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 66(3):977–1001, 2006.

[22] S. Kothari and S. Mukhopadhyay. Some theorems in linear thermoelasticity with dual phase-lags for an anisotropic medium. *Journal of Thermal Stresses*, 36(10):985–1000, 2013.

[23] S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Kothari, and R. Kumar. Dual phase-lag thermoelasticity. *Encyclopedia of Thermal Stresses*, pages 1003–1019, 2014.

[24] R. Picard. A structural observation for linear material laws in classical mathematical physics. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 32(14):1768–1803, 2009.

[25] M. Waurick. How far away is the harmonic mean from the homogenized matrix? Technical report, TU Dresden, 2012. Submitted to Differential and Integral Equations, arXiv: 1204.3768.

[26] M. Waurick. Homogenization of a class of linear partial differential equations. *Asymptotic Anal.*, 82:271–294, 2013.

[27] M. Waurick. Homogenization in fractional elasticity. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 46(2):1551–1576, 2014.

[28] R. Picard and D. McGhee. *Partial differential equations. A unified Hilbert space approach.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

[29] A. Kalauch, R. Picard, S. Siegmund, S. Trostorff, and M. Waurick. A Hilbert space perspective on ordinary differential equations with memory term. *J. Dyn. Differ. Equations*, 26(2):369–399, 2014.

[30] S. Trostorff. A characterization of boundary conditions yielding maximal monotone operators. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 2014. to appear, arXiv: 1310.5014.

[31] R. Leis. Initial boundary value problems in mathematical physics. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner; Chichester - New York etc.: John Wiley & Sons., 1986.

[32] D. McGhee and R. Picard. A class of evolutionary operators and its applications to electroseismic waves in anisotropic, inhomogeneous media. *Oper. Matrices*, 5(4):665–678, 2011.

[33] R. Picard. Linear thermo-elasticity in nonsmooth media. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 28(18):2183–2199, 2005.